

Conference Evaluation Form

Did the information presented in this workshop meet your expectations and needs? Please explain.

No. Not enough managers present – This means water managers, water masters, irrigators, BOR project managers needed explanation of relation between Klamath Project and lower basin.

More than I had expected.

Generally; however, due to the short time-frame, a lot of the presentation were repackaged from prior presentations – There's more recent information to be presented and giving a longer lead time would facilitate that.

Talks were too long. Highlights should have been presented in 15-minutes.

Yes. Very good high quality information. I learned a lot.

Yes. It was very focused on the lower basin issues.

Yes, but flow mgmt. is still unresolved, obviously.

Yes. Better than expected. More new data by credible speakers presented that expected. Panel interactions helpful, especially to clarify any perceived difference.

No. Networking info missing. No contact information for speakers and participants. Need a least e-mail/phone.

Was the mix between presentations and follow-up discussions useful and productive? Please explain.

Please keep speakers to there allotted times – questions and answers are more effective of time to find out how different groups interpret needs.

Yes, but some facilitators did not do a good enough job of keeping speakers within the allotted time.

The last day was very useful, and could affect more attendance by happening at the end of each day (there were only about 1/5 the attendance at the last morning.

Talks went too long so number of questions were few.

There was not enough time for good discussions. While the content of the presentations was excellent, too many presentations were crammed together with too few breaks or too short breaks.

Yes. It was very good and enhanced the information presented.

Yes. Otherwise, how can there be an exchange during these kinds of conferences?

Don't know. Only opportunity for discussion is on last day for ½ hr. before lunch. Couldn't stay for a 4th day, but if I could, this time slot is not especially conjunctive to discussion.

Keep better time mgmt. with speakers, like day 1. Day 2 better. Need to correct observations of some speakers, such as perception of progress on sub-basins with monitoring and restoration. Give us map of Klamath Basin in the binder-8 ½ x 11 with some details like tribes and dams.

What specific information was of greatest value to you? Please describe below.

All. Very good background on basin issues – however, Salmon issues predominated. Deas' presentation was excellent for geo-engineering aspects of basin.

Overview of the entire Lower Klamath situation. Most attention focused on Upper & it's good to have an overview of Lower.

The interaction of the speakers – one heard the ideas of an earlier speaker were sometimes included and developed in a later speaker presentation.

Background for flow study.

Good discussions on current research on hydrology and aquatic habitat.

Tuesday's presentations and the relicensing section on Wed.

Fish productivity modeling...based on habitat quality and flow information.

County and stakeholders perspectives.

Mike Deas talk on Big Picture hydrology and water quality. Nancy Parker's description of different models. Different methods to estimated unimpaired flows. Update on status of Klamath studies, basin-wide.

What specific areas would you suggest for improving future science conferences? Please describe below.

More geomorphology of basin, more Tribal contributions. Attendance and information from California (F&G), especially CEC were great contribution.

Suggest cutting back on the number of presentations. Although all the sessions were interesting, some could have been combined and shortened. Agenda was too packed and the days too long.

Either reduce the number of speakers or provide more time – we always run over, and for good reason – the issues needed discussion.

The absence of the work conducted by the Forest Service was conspicuously absent, particularly since they manage 70% of the land in the basin. Given the very nature of the tributaries as refugia, this seems a rather significant oversight.

Try to get speakers on the conditions in and role of the tributaries (in addition to Scott & Shasta) in providing spawning & rearing habitat.

Informal evening gatherings (topic-based) to allow for more networking.

Sub-basin Science Forums, like on Scott & Shasta. Have written materials (PowerPoint talk) for audience. Getting consensus on unimpaired runoff estimates for Basin. Common Vision of what Basin's future looks like-presumes ag or not.

If this conference was repeated, what would you prefer for the frequency, length, location, and time of year?

2x annually until CIP is up and running, then annually for results and emerging needs confab.

Another more convenient location would be better. An area closer to a major airport where flying or driving in/out is more convenient.

Earlier in the year. Do a whole basin conference with field trip or two.

Frequency and location ok. Length – 3days max.

Length of conference was greater but include more breaks. The catered lunch was very nice.

Every other year, same location, same number of talks, but spread over four full days. This seems to be a good time of year or perhaps earlier. Summer and fall are bad for people in the field.

1x per year. 3 days in length. March/April

Need to bring Basin-wide science to the sub-basins so locals can hear thin, & not just the “scientists” who can afford to travel & HSU for 3-4 days. 1-2 day road show in each sub-basin?

What next steps would you recommend to keep discussions going on future science needs and priorities?

When needs are prioritized, have different agencies identify with specific information needs, that is, agencies will define their roles and responsibilities (assumed responsibilities) in the Klamath Basin Plan.

Recommend combining Upper & Lower Klamath issues & focus agenda on just the key issues – Not every single issue. If you want to address more issues that time available, then maybe have breakout sessions and repeat some of the sessions with greater interest. You can make this determination by doing a survey of the participants when they are registering. Giving Stakeholders an opportunity to voice their opinions is a great idea.

Focus groups on a quarterly basis, staggered, so one could attend more than one topic.

You can have the best science but there must be the social/political will to implement the science. Seems like there is a need for a science-based information meeting targeting policy decision matters.

The Trinity list serve (env-trinity, shepherded by Tom Stokely) is very useful for disseminating timely information. People mostly post policy and media info and flow schedules. Wish people would post links to latest scientific studies and data too. Need to do same for Klamath list serve-revive it.

Website that is maintained and paid for by the BOR.

Neutral setting, like college campus, to have topic discussions. Need to hear from those applying science to management practices too, or just preaching to chair. Focus on three topic area with smaller discussion groups and trained facilitator to get to consensus.

Please share any other general comments or reactions you might have.

Excellent-need to synthesize Upper and Lower Basin science information needs and produce a full Basin policy. Bring end to artificial political split; use ecology of river system/ watershed as basis of management and restoration.

Offer an optional field trip (1/2 day) to a project site would be helpful to put things in perspective.

Can you make the power point presentations available on the web for us? Independent reviewer comments and interaction was good. The catered meals are a great strategy to keep attendees at the conference.

One of the worst time-managed meetings I have been to. Moderators should have kept speakers on time. People were antsy when lunch was not served.

Days were too long. Going from 8:00am to 1:30pm without a snack is bad for people's attention spans. There should have been either food at the break or lunch at noon. The food that was provided was good. I like having no concurrent sessions, so everyone heard the same thing.

It would have helped to have more detailed handouts of each talk. Power Point summary (6 slide/page) at minimum. We are trying to improve communication of science among all players in Basin, but we need a permanent record of the findings presented to do that. We each tend to "hear" what we want to from presentations, so accuracy of findings presented must be encouraged through written record, not just "oral". All of our Science Needs Wish lists still need to relate to objectives. Why do we need this? No all questions can readily fit into hypothesis testing. Unfortunately.